

Drilling off of our shore means jobs for Americans right now, real jobs, high-paying jobs, the kind of jobs that support whole families and pay to get kids into college. And it's not jobs on just oil platforms in the gulf. Think about all the other support industries, transportation, food, equipment, parts, insurers, construction and so. These real, high-dollar jobs would give a boost to our economy. These jobs are vital to America's families and to our economy, and it would keep American money in America. There's a real solution right in front of us for job and energy development.

But the government continues to move in the opposite direction. The cap-and-trade national energy tax, now called the climate change bill, will destroy the U.S. energy industry. Millions of jobs that go along with it will also be lost.

□ 1945

It is a national tax on energy consumption. Plus, it won't really help the climate. Instead of taxing energy, we should find more energy and encourage American energy development.

But we cannot drill off of our shores because I guess it will upset the blood pressure of the environmental elites. So, no new drilling.

However, Mr. Speaker, I do have breaking news. The administration does support offshore drilling. According to the Wall Street Journal, the government is loaning over \$2 billion in taxpayer money to a Brazilian company called Petrobras. Now, where did the United States, first of all, get that \$2 billion to loan to a foreign company? I thought we were broke. How come taxpayer money is going to a Brazilian oil company anyway? Why isn't that money staying here in America?

This Brazilian oil company is drilling off the shore of, not the United States, but Brazil. And are we getting that oil? Well, no, because China has a contract to purchase the hundreds of millions of barrels of oil those Brazilian oil fields will produce with taxpayer money. Isn't that lovely?

Let me explain it this way. Here is a chart. Right here this represents the United States. Of course we have these signs, no offshore drilling off the United States coast. We can't do that. But we are sending \$2 billion of American money down to a Brazilian oil company so they can, of course, drill off their shores. And is that money or oil coming back to us? I don't think so. That bag of money is going to China.

Now, this seems a bit strange to me. Why are American taxpayers footing the bill in Brazil without getting the oil or getting the money? Why aren't we expanding our own offshore drilling instead of sending American money to Brazil? Does anybody have the answer to that question? It seems like we should drill off our own coast, keep American money in America and take care of our own energy needs. We have millions of jobs just sitting there wait-

ing to be created off our shores. Drilling on the Outer Continental Shelf and extracting oil shale would provide the much-needed boost to the American economy. And we should stop funding oil-producing countries that support terrorism and the Middle East.

So what are we waiting for? If we would have started a year ago when the ban was lifted, our economy would be better than it is today. We would have had more jobs, jobs, jobs. It is way past the time for us to get started taking care of America. Don't drill in Brazil with American money. Don't take care of China. Drill American and take care of America.

And that's just the way it is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

WHERE ARE THE JOBS?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I come from the great State of Michigan where we currently have the highest unemployment in the Nation and where our citizens have suffered more than most in this economic downturn. And every week when I come to Washington, I am constantly amazed that this Congress isn't laser focused on creating jobs, because the question being asked by the American people is: Where are the jobs?

When President Obama said he wanted an economic stimulus bill principally focused on tax cuts and infrastructure investment, I was all for it. But the bill that was passed by the Democrat majority in Congress really was unrecognized from what was originally proposed. That bill focused much more on expanding the size of government than expanding jobs in the private sector. Americans were told that if this huge expansion of government were passed, that 2 to 3 million new jobs would be created and unemployment would not reach 8 percent. And what are the results actually?

Well, since that time, our economy has shed nearly 3 million jobs and the unemployment rate has now reached nearly 10 percent. In my home State of Michigan, it is in the 15 percentile.

Nine months after the passage of the failed stimulus plan, Americans are still asking: Where are the jobs?

After passing a jobs bill that did not create jobs, House Democrats passed a cap-and-trade national energy tax. This national energy tax will destroy millions of jobs in this struggling economy. Manufacturing, which is so important in my home State of Michigan, would be especially hard hit when millions more good-paying jobs are shipped overseas to nations that are not going to put this jobs-killing tax on their manufacturing companies.

Struggling American families will also be very hard hit. The Obama administration's own estimates project that this legislation would cost our economy \$200 billion every year, which means an increase of \$1,700 for every American household. That means hard-pressed Americans are going to pay more for energy while at the same time having their jobs put at risk.

I would ask this, Mr. Speaker, as the American people continue to do: Where are the jobs?

Congress is now considering a health care reform bill that would amount to a government takeover and would be funded with job-killing tax increases and cuts to Medicare impacting the coverage of millions of American seniors. That bill, H.R. 3200, places an 8 percent tax on payroll for every business in this Nation that does not offer health care coverage to their workers.

Well, I have talked to countless employers, and they tell you that their costs run much higher than 8 percent, so they would end the private coverage that they currently give to their employees and dump them all out on the public plan.

Republicans have been accused of being the party of no because we have stood against this job-killing agenda, but we have offered alternatives, better alternatives, and it is actually the Democrats in Congress who have said no to these ideas. Let me cite a few specific examples.

We have offered an alternative to the stimulus plan that, according to the formula created by President Obama's own economic team, would create twice the jobs at half the cost. We have offered an all-of-the-above national energy plan as an alternative to the Democrats' national energy tax. Our plan would encourage the development of clean alternative energy while allowing the development of domestic supplies, which would bring energy costs down instead of driving them up. And it would create jobs here in America, and it would make America more energy independent.

We have offered commonsense approaches to health care reforms that would provide greater competition, increase access to care, and reduce costs. We feel that individuals should be able to purchase health care across State lines, and small businesses should be able to group together to open up more options and reduce costs to protect private health care. And we believe we need to enact real medical liability reform to end junk lawsuits that drive up